

RATIONAL HEGELIANISM

THE SCIENCE OF NOOLOGY

CHRISTOPHER RICHARD WADE DETTLING

THE INTERNET ARCHIVE

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2018

THE SCIENCE OF NOOLOGY

WORLD MIND AND NOOSPHERE

In the first decades of the 21st century a new science is born: *Noology*. The brave new science of Noology comprises two fields, the theoretical and practical: (1) *Mind Control* and (2) the *Thought Police*. *Noology is not the primitive “psychological warfare” of the 20th century, but a universal science which involves every dimension of Global life. Noology is not Cyber warfare, because within both the theoretical and practical fields, the distinction between domestic and foreign does not apply. Psychology and cybernetics are not entirely divorced from theoretical and practical Noology, but are rather subordinate fields that sometimes, in some areas, fall within the purview of its scope. Unlike psychology and cybernetics proper, Noology is the highest political and economic form of the computer sciences. The aim of Noology is therefore the defense, protection and preservation of the Noosphere, which is the political and economic realm of digital and electronic knowledge, both public and private:*

Noology is therefore the guardian of computational and technological power.

In the fields of theoretical and practical Noetics, the pejorative connotation of “mind control” and “thought police” popularized in the 20th century does not apply to the meaning of Noology: As censorship, the meanings of “mind control” and “thought police” are associated with *anti-democratic and totalitarian regimes* in the literature of political science. This is not the case in the New Science of Noetics. The political meaning of *censorship* since the French Revolution is here contrasted with its economic significance, *stricto sensu*; the economic production and consumption of goods also involves censorship in the forms of supply and demand, as *utility, value* and *worth*; censorship as a form of “propaganda” under capitalism is an arm of advertising and marketing. Censorship in the political economy of the Industrial Revolution is not the same as its counterpart in the tradition of the French Revolution: *British monarchism is not commensurate with European royalism, feudalism and aristocracy, either before or after the revolutions in Europe*. In the New Science of Noetics, “bad” censorship is therefore contrasted with “good” censorship,—*as truth is distinguished from error, as science is contrasted with ideology*. This contrast, however, is effectuated within the realm of 20th century etymology, because of the *world historical significance of totalitarianism in the modern European political and economic vocabulary of the past hundred years*. In the mindset of that historical period, the lexicographical

combination of the meanings of “good” and “bad” censorship in the field of political economy is not permissible because impractical and self-contradictory: *The etymological combination is politically and economically inexpedient.* In the New Science of Noetics, the *political and economic significance* of “mind control” and “thought police” is not therefore effectuated in terms of the *20th century meanings of censorship.*

The world historical origins of the New Science of Noetics are evidenced in the first decade of the 21st century, from out of the collapse of the Cold War, especially in Europe,—in the digital revolution of supercomputers and Global telecommunications networks. As we shall discover, an essential group of extremely important ideas which underpin the digital revolution are predicated upon the theoretical and practical notion of Noology, as the circular and coaxial series of *accumulation, production, dissemination, consumption, re-accumulation and reproduction* of “information” in a seamless and ever-increasing web of Noematic complexifications, under the general albeit politically and economically vague conception of “datum.” *This “predication” is effectuated in terms of the Noetic “logic” of computational and technological power.*

In the Noetic world of today, the modern European distinctions are obliterated between science, philosophy and history as well as religion, literature and art. European modernity after the French Revolution upholds “science” against pseudo-science or ideology in

the name of Kant: *Even when “scientists” distinguish themselves from ideologues, when they press—gang Locke, Leibniz, Hume and others into their cause (as well as Descartes, Spinoza, Berkeley and Hegel or some other combination of rationalism versus empiricism), they always make use of their Kantian inspired categories of Transzendental Logik.* Modern Europeans reconcile or oppose Kant and Hegel in the name of *science*, inspired by their Kantian categories of the *Transzendentalphilosophie*: Modern science in their eyes is named as phenomenalism, realism, naturalism, empiricism, epistemology and so forth, but always in stark contrast to Western philosophy as *Platonism in the Kantian sense of the Critique of Pure Reason*.

Science in the 20th century connotation inherited from Kant and the French Revolution is even divided into the “hard” and “soft” sciences: Physics, biology and chemistry, for instance, are mildly opposed to economics, political science and sociology,—in the name of phenomenalism, realism, naturalism, empiricism, epistemology and so forth, in stark contrast to ideology as *Platonism in the Kantian sense of the Critique of Pure Reason*. Philosophy is likewise divided from sophistry, as scientific philosophy and the philosophy of science, in the philosophy of physics, the philosophy of language, the philosophy of economics, the philosophy of law (non–metaphysical jurisprudence) and so on,—in the name of phenomenalism, realism, naturalism, empiricism, epistemology and so forth, in stark contradistinction to metaphysics and ontology as *Platonism in the*

Kantian sense of the Critique of Pure Reason. Science and scientific theory are practical, according to modern Europeans: The influential modern European distinctions between theory and practice are always cast within the Kantian inspired categorial structure of *Transzendentalphilosophie*. Even mathematics and logic (deductive and inductive) are rendered “scientific,” as so-called *mathematical logic (probability and statistical inference)*, whether as *logicism, formalism, intuitionism* and so on, and opposed to the “outdated and pseudo-scientific” pure mathematics and logic of Western metaphysics as *Platonic idealism in the Kantian sense of the Critique of Pure Reason*. Modern European “scientists” (intelligentsia) are therefore blind to the conception of the New Science of Noetics, because trapped within the mental confines of their *Transzendental* prison inherited from Kant and the French Revolution, in the struggle between monarchism and republicanism,—as *totalitarianism versus democracy, or some such version thereof*.

The same remarks also apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the “computer sciences”: Computer “scientists” are also blind to the conception of the New Science of Noetics, because trapped within the mental confines of their *Transzendental* prison inherited from Kant and the French Revolution, in the struggle between monarchism and republicanism,—as *totalitarianism versus democracy*. The Kantian blindness of modern European unreason affects computer scientists’ conceptualization of an essential group of *extremely important conceptions* which underpin the digital revolution, and which are

predicated upon the theoretical and practical notion of Noology, *as the seamless and ever-increasing coaxial web of Noematic complexifications, under the general albeit politically and economically vague conception of “datum.”*

In other words, European modernity is blind to the rational (pure) Hegelian conception of the *Weltgeist* as the Anglo-Saxon *World Mind*, the mind of the world, which greatly advanced Western thought along the road of Noologism, especially in the 20th century. Globalism is *Eurocentricisme* in the mindset of European modernity, otherwise world civilization is imperialism and totalitarianism: The *Weltgeist* of rational Hegelianism is thereby opposed to the Kantio-Hegelian *Zeitgeist* of *Transzendentalphilosophie*,—*unless rejected outright by Kantians and Kantian anti-Hegelians*. European “multipolarity” is *Eurocentrisme* because its *polarity* is the *Transzendental* prison of Kant and the French Revolution, in the 20th century *polarization* between Americanism and anti-Americanism,—as *American totalitarianism* versus *European democracy*: The *unipolarity* of modern European political and economic irrationalism is the *multipolarity* of *Eurocentrisme* in the world of today.

The outdated and surpassed mentality of European modernity, wherever found in the 21st century world, whether as Kantianism, Kantian anti-Hegelianism or Kantio-Hegelianism, is an intellectual disease, especially in the realm of politics and economics.

In the fields of theoretical and practical Noetics, the pejorative connotation of “mind control” and “thought police” *does not therefore apply to the 21st century meaning of Noology*: As censorship, the meanings of “mind control” and “thought police” are associated more with the connotation of *self-education and re-education, in the rational Hegelian sense of self-determination as causa sui, as the Noetic self-consciousness of the World Mind. Self-determination is therefore an extremely important conception, in the Noetic sense, as the rationality that underpins the 21st century digital revolution, and which is predicated upon the theoretical and practical notion of Noology, as the Noetic conception of self-conscious datum, in the seamless and ever-increasing coaxial web of Noematic complexifications of the World Mind.*

The World Mind of pure Hegelianism is the Noosphere: “Mind is only what it does, and its act is to make itself the object of its own consciousness. In history its act is to gain consciousness of itself as mind, to apprehend itself in its interpretation of itself to itself. This apprehension is its being and its principle, and the completion of apprehension at one stage is at the same time the rejection of that stage and its transition to a higher. To use abstract phraseology, the mind apprehending this apprehension anew, or in other words returning to itself again out of its rejection of this lower stage of apprehension, is the mind of the higher stage than that on which it stood in its earlier apprehension.”¹

The Noosphere is therefore the World Mind of genuine Hegelianism as the history of the world: “Since mind is implicitly and actually reason, and reason is explicit to itself in mind as knowledge, world history is the necessary development, out of the concept of mind’s freedom alone, of the moments of reason and so of the self-consciousness and freedom of mind. This development is the interpretation and actualization of the universal mind.”²

The history of the world is the self-consciousness freedom of mind, the interpretation and actualization of the World Mind, as reason explicit to itself in mind as knowledge. Noology is therefore reason explicit to itself in mind as knowledge, the interpretation and actualization of the World Mind, as the history of the world, the highest political and economic form of the computer sciences,—not as “artificial intelligence,” but as the Noetic scientivity of the Noosphere.

The New Science of Noology, the Noetic scientivity of the Noosphere as the Weltgeist of rational Hegelianism, *is the speculative logical and dialectical system of the genuine (pure) Hegelian philosophical science of absolute idealism in the American world of today.* Computer science, as comprehended by the avatars of European modernity, is a delusion in the 21st century: *The outdated modern European distinctions between science and ideology are surpassed and overcome in the American political and economic*

rationality of Globalism. They are overcome, the modern European Kantian, Kantian anti-Hegelian and Kantio-Hegelian divisions between science, philosophy and history as well as religion, literature and art: The World Mind of today, apprehends modernity anew, in other words, returns to itself again out of its rejection of the modern phase of apprehension, the rejection and return constitute the mentality of Globalism as world civilization, the highest stage of universal freedom as American Liberty,—higher than the modern, mediaeval, ancient and archaic mentalities. We name the theoretical and practical upholding and uplifting of the mentality of Globalism, established in the Global divisions of American political and economic rationality, as the New Science of Noology, the guardian of American computational and technological superpower.

The 20th century Kantian, Kantian anti-Hegelian and Kantio-Hegelian versions of Noology and the Noosphere are overcome and surpassed in the supremacy of rational Hegelianism: The 21st century revolutionary Global power of the Noosphere is the Noological political economy of Noetic scientivity as the developmental unification of the coaxial integration of the American world.

ENDNOTES

1. Hegel, *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, Thomas Malcolm Knox, translator, Oxford, Oxfordshire, Oxford University Press, 1952, §343, 216-217. [1942]

See: "That I have laid out some of the philosophical reasons for this doctrine in the third edition of another writing of mine, an outline of sorts, named *Americanism*, is of slight importance: That the teaching therein involves the sciences of economics and politics is of some interest, however, and therefore has a bearing upon the subject at hand, namely, as the developmental unification and coaxial integration of the American world. In that work I flatter myself as the first Hegelian philosopher ever to apply the Dialectic of Hegel to the Hegelian Dialectic: 'Modern irrationalism, in order to validate pseudo-Hegelianism and anti-Hegelianism, squares the *Lecture Notes* and the great works published by Hegel in his lifetime. Pseudo-Hegelianism and anti-Hegelianism thus squares both Kant and Hegel in order to prove the speculative logical and dialectical system of the genuine Hegel's philosophical science of Absolute Idealism is flawed. Irrationalism thus perverts the history of philosophy and modern Europe ... Pseudo-Hegelianism and anti-Hegelianism is therefore the political and economic mask of modern European *Raison d'État*. One drawback will never be remedied in Hegel philology: The *Lecture*

Notes [Zusatze and Vorlesungen] are not authoritative and are therefore useless in the exact determination of the ultimate worth of genuine Hegelianism ... In the 20th century upwards of 500 million human beings were slaughtered in the contagion of modern political and economic satanism, more than in all the periods of history combined: Many hundreds of millions more were utterly ruined and destroyed by the most barbaric slavery ever recorded in the world. This is the ultimate verdict of exact historiography and universal history. *From whence comes the disease of modern unreason?"*

Christopher Richard Wade Dettling, *Stronghold of Hegel: Modern Enemies of Plato and Hegel*, 1st edition, San Francisco, California, The Medium Corporation, 2016.

See also: "After Hegel's death, his former students came together with the rather noble thought of assembling various transcripts of the lecture series he gave and to which they had access, hoping to bring to the light of a general public the 'system' that [they] were convinced was completed for years and presented orally in the lecture hall. However, the *methodologies through which they assembled these transcripts into standalone monographs, with the aid of Hegel's own manuscripts for his lectures, is [are] dubious at best*. They paid little to no attention to changes between different lecture courses, combining them as they saw fit to guarantee the logical progression of the dialectical movement as they interpreted it. But without the original source material, it was impossible to test the suspicion that they may have falsified Hegel's own views. Indeed, it was all we had

to go on to have any understanding of his views. Now, however, many manuscripts and transcripts—even ones not available to his students—have been found. When one compares these manuscripts and transcripts with the lectures published by his students, the differences between them are in no case simply philological niceties ... *this information may drastically challenge our historical picture of Hegel.*”

Sean J. McGrath & Joseph Carew, editors, “Introduction: What Remains of German Idealism?” *Rethinking German Idealism*, Joseph Carew, Wes Furlotte, Jean–Christophe Goddard, Adrian Johnston, Cem Kömürcü, Sean J. McGrath, Constantin Rauer, Alexander Schnell, F. Scott Scribner, Devin Zane Shaw, Konrad Utz & Jason M. Wirth, contributors, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, 1–19; 4. [Italics added]

See also: “Hegel’s own course notes and those of his students should be used with caution to clarify and illustrate the meaning of the texts he published during his lifetime ... In general, the student notes written during or after Hegel’s classes should be used with caution ... What has been said about the student notes must also be applied to the so–called *Zusatze* (additions), added by ‘the friends’ to the third edition of the *Encyclopedia* (1830) and the book on Rechtsphilosophie ... Some commentators, however, seem to prefer the *Zusatze* over Hegel’s own writings; additions are sometimes even quoted as the only textual evidence for the interpretation of highly controversial issues. For scholarly use, however, we should use them only as

applications, confirmations, or concretizations of Hegel's theory. Only in cases where authentic texts are unavailable may they be accepted as indications of Hegel's answers to questions that are not treated in his handwritten or published work. If they contradict the explicit theory of the authorized texts, we can presume that the student is wrong, unless we can show that it is plausible that they express a change in the evolution of Hegel's thought ... According to Leopold von Henning's preface (pp. vi–vii) in his edition (1839) of the *Encyclopädie* of 1830, the editors of the *Encyclopedia* sometimes changed or completed the sentences in which the students had rendered Hegel's classes."

Adriaan Theodoor Basilius Peperzak, *Modern Freedom: Hegel's Legal, Moral, and Political Philosophy (Studies in German Idealism)*, Reinier Munk, series editor, Dordrecht, Springer Science+Business Media, B.V., 2001, xvi–27–28–29–29.

See also: "The transcripts known today for all the Berlin lecture series are consistently, even surprisingly, reliable testimonies ... It may indeed be disconcerting that only today do we doubt—and not everyone does—that Hegel's lectures ... are actually reproduced authentically in the published [Berlin] edition ... that did not become full-blown for more than a hundred and fifty years. We can hardly examine here all the reasons for this circumstance."

Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert, "Introduction: The Shape and Influence of Hegel's *Aesthetics*," *Lectures on the Philosophy of Art: The Hotho Transcript of the 1823 Berlin Lectures*, Robert F. Brown,

editor and translator, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014, 7–176; 32–36–36–36.

See finally: “[The] more sympathetic tradition in Hegel scholarship has reasserted itself decisively since the middle of this century, to such an extent that there is now a virtual consensus among knowledgeable scholars that the earlier images of Hegel, as philosopher of the reactionary Prussian restoration and forerunner of modern totalitarianism, are simply wrong, whether they are viewed as accounts of Hegel’s attitude toward Prussian politics or as broader philosophical interpretations of his theory of the state.”

Allen William Wood, editor, “Editor’s Introduction,” *Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel; Hugh Barr Nisbet, translator, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, *vii–xxxii*; ix. **[1991]**

2. Hegel, *Ibidem*, §342, 216.

©2018 Christopher Richard Wade Dettling, *Rational Hegelianism: The Science of Noology*. All rights reserved. This work is only for ARCHIVE.ORG and the INTERNET ARCHIVE and their users: Users are not permitted to mount this writing on any network servers. No part of this writing may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or

information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the author, except for reading and browsing via the World Wide Web.

We wish to thank our benefactors over the years for their goodwill:
Humanity benefits greatly from the rise of Americanism in the world.